

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	Los Angeles County Flood Control District	Amount Requested	\$20,000,000
Proposal Title	Santa Anita Stormwater Flood Management and Seismic Strengthening Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$40,000,000

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

One project is included in the proposal: Santa Anita Stormwater Flood Management and Seismic Strengthening Project. This Project will improve Los Angeles County Flood Control District facilities to better manage stormwater runoff from the Santa Anita Canyon watershed and achieve the following goals: 1) reduce flood damage to the downstream communities, 2) increase groundwater recharge of the local groundwater basin and 3) improve public safety by remediating seismic safety issues at the Santa Anita Dam and the Santa Anita Debris Basin.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. possible
Work Plan	15/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	12/12
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	5/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	9/12
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	8/10
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			55

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The applicant presents clear goals of the proposal and consistent with the objective listed in the adopted IRWM Plan. The need for the project is well discussed. The applicant further provides a good description and a tabulated overview of the various components of the proposal showing project status. While each component provides its own benefits, the linkages and synergies among the components would result in optimized benefits when implemented together. The listed task items for each component are of adequate detail and indicate that the project can be implemented. Studies and technical information supporting the feasibility of the project are well documented and submitted designs for completed components agree with design tasks in the Work Plan. A listing of required permits and needed California

Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation along with status and schedule is provided and included in the Work Plan.

Budget

Not all costs listed in the Budget appear reasonable. Also, the Budget lacks both 1) detailed Budget costs associated with some of the budget items, and 2) documentation supporting the cost estimates provided for many Budget items. For example, for Subtask 9.3 (Project Construction), the applicant simply allocates lump sums to several broadly identified construction components in this Subtask's Budget (a \$33.5M Budget item) without providing any further cost breakdowns or documentation to support the lump sums provided. Also, for Task 4 (pg. 4-3) "Assessment and Evaluation", and Task 7 "Permitting", some detailed costs are shown (including hourly estimates and unit costs per discipline); however, no explanation was found describing how the estimates provided were derived (engineer estimates, experience with similar projects completed, etc.).

Schedule

The Schedule is consistent and reasonable and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation of at least one project of the Proposal no later than six months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). The applicant presents a detailed schedule for the project that adequately documents all task elements within the Proposal. Furthermore, the Schedule includes task start and end dates, project milestones, and a Schedule that is presented in Gantt chart format.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

This criterion is less than fully addressed and is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. While the performance measures for verifying improved public safety and increased groundwater recharge are quantified applicant did not quantify the potential flood risk and flood damage reduction that will be realized with the project. A project performance table is provided showing core elements of the monitoring plan. Project metrics include stormwater inflows behind the dam and at the debris basin, volume of recharge into groundwater basin, and runoff releases into downstream channel. The output indicators listed should effectively track output and the targets are achievable. The applicant lays out where data will be collected and how the data will be used to monitor performance.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

High levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal. The quality of the analysis and supporting documentation demonstrates these benefits. Total net present value (NPV) of costs is \$33.35 million. FDR claimed benefits are \$117.992 million based on avoided costs following a seismic event. Actual NPV of benefits are likely significantly understated by the applicant, as based on avoided costs following a rain event alone (i.e., not considering seismic events), benefits could exceed \$500 million. These dollar benefits estimates do not count fatalities that could occur without the project. There are over 13,000 residences and 12 schools that could be inundated after the dam failed. The potential for fatalities is greater for the seismic event because of limited warning time.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of Water Quality and Other Expected benefits can be realized through this proposal. However, these benefits are not monetized. Qualitative benefits claimed include the improved groundwater quality resulting from additional stormwater recharge, and ecosystem benefits to the Bay-

Delta from reduced exports. Water quality benefits and reduced chance of fatalities from reduced chance of a dam failure should have been taken into account.

Program Preferences

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs; Drought Preparedness; Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; Practice Integrated Flood Management; and Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality.